CORRES. AND CHARL

V. Douglas

PAT PATENT APPLICATION #

Our Docket No. 910022.ORI

TRADEMARK OFFICE

7-9-93

Re App : Michael R. Forman

THE UNITED STATES

June 24, 1993

S.N. : 07/800,201

R. Forman.

Art Unit 3306

Filed: November 29, 1991

Examiner Anthony Gutowski

For : LASER BONDING OF ANGIOPLASTY BALLOON CATHETERS

\_\_\_\_\_

RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 CFR 1.116

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231 Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action of March 31, 1993, the applicant hereby requests reconsideration of Claims 16-31, particularly in light of the accompanying Declaration of Michael

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of all claims at issue is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-18, 22-25 and 28-31 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,958,634 (Jang).

The above rejection, originally asserted against Claims 16-18 and 22-25 is asserted against later added Claims 28-31 as well. The Jang patent has been discussed in applicant's amendment of December 22, 1992. Arguments in that amendment, as to why the Jang patent does not anticipate the present invention, are incorporated in this Response.

Further, it is imperative to consider the Jang patent for what it teaches as a whole. As noted previously, the Jang patent does nothing more than list "laser bonding" as one of several